[30th October 1933

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI :—" In making his recommendations, the Inspector of Municipal Councils has been directed to remember this question."

Mr. V. T. ARASU :—" The Government are stated to have recently appointed certain panchayat officers to certain districts. May I know whether they have done so in accordance with their provincialization scheme?"

The hon. the RAJA OF BOBBILI :—" I must ask for notice of the question."

Principles governing the distribution of grants among the Panchayat Boards for roads and water works.

* 136 *Q.*—Mr. P. V. KRISHNAYYA CHOUDARI: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) what the amounts placed at the disposal of the Inspector of Local Boards are for distribution among panchayats for (i) roads and (ii) water works, separately during 1932–33;

(*b*) how the amount was distributed districtwar; and

(*c*) what the principles adopted were for such distribution?

A.—(*a*) (i) Rupees 2,50,000.

(ii) Rupees 1,10,000.

(*b*) A statement[a] is laid on the table. The unit of distribution is the panchayat and not the district.

(*c*) The main principle was to make the distribution as equitable as possible and to serve as many panchayats as possible. The panchayats were taken up in order of the backwardness of the district concerned, the panchayats in the most backward districts being taken first and, as far as possible, given whatever they wanted consistently with the claims of other similarly circumstanced panchayats. Then the applications from panchayats in the less backward districts were taken up and disposed of in order. In order to be fair to all panchayats alike, applications from panchayats which received no grants or meagre grants in previous years were given preference over applications from panchayats which had received adequate grants in the past. And in order to serve the maximum number of panchayats, other things being equal, estimates for limited amounts were sanctioned in preference to estimates for large amounts. Estimates for very large works were turned down as they were not likely to be completed before the close of the year and as Government could not be committed to expenditure in future years on their account. Applications from panchayats which had made default in previous years and allowed funds to lapse in the absence of very good reasons were, as a rule, turned down.

[a] Printed as Appendix VIII on page 125 infra.